

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/508,617	03/14/2000	KOJI IDEI	000225 8477	
23850	7590 11/22/2006	EXAMINER		
	NG, KRATZ, QUINTO	FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D		
1725 K STRE SUITE 1000	EET, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20006		1774	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/508,617	IDEI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Lawrence D. Ferguson	1774

Advisory Action	09/508,617 IDEI ET AL.		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lawrence D. Ferguson	1774	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A 1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: a) ☑ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a)	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR a the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, affitice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must of the final rejection. Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth after than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	R ALLOWANCE. Appeal. To avoid abaidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cfust be filed within one in the final rejection, while date of the final rejection.	ndonment of ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following ichever is later. In on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPÉP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filled on A brief in comp filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filled, any reply must be filled AMENDMENTS	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data. Oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be unsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final Office te of the final rejection, effiled within two months avoid dismissal of the	te extension fee ate extension fee be action; or (2) as even if timely filed, as of the date of
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 	nsideration and/or search (see NOw); tter form for appeal by materially recorresponding number of finally recorresponding number of Non-Co: 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Illustration is submitted in a separate, will not be entered, or b) will	TE below); ducing or simplifying t ected claims. mpliant Amendment (timely filed amendme	PTOL-324).
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-7. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	d sufficient reasons why the affidave a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the overcome all rejections under appeary and was not earlier presented. So not the status of the claims after ent does NOT place the application in	it or other evidence is date of filing a brief, v al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 ntry is below or attach	vill <u>not</u> be is to provide a). ed.

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant seeks to further broaden the claims by amending claim 1 to cancel the phrase, "present on a surface, the cationic resin". Additionally, applicant seeks to further limit claim 7 by cancelling the phrase "present on surfaces" and adding the phrase, "adhered to" both sides of the support.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Fujioka does not disclose a cationic resin present on the surface of the recording layer) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant claims a cationic resin adhered to the support. Fujioka teaches a coating being applied to the base sheet (support), where the coating comprises cationic resins, (column 5, lines 33-44). Therefore, the rejections are maintained for reasons of record.

SUPERVISORY DE

Art Unis 122 of

11/17/04